

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been rejected. Claim 1 is amended by this Amendment. Support for this Amendment is found generally throughout the specification and figures. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claim 1 remains pending in the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks Examiner Charles Adams for the interview of July 30, 200. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of Examiner in the interview. Amendments have been made to the claims as discussed with the Examiner to overcome previously rejected subject matter based on 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chandra et al. (U.S. Patent 6,058,389).

Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 recites:

A method for integrating messaging functionality into database operations on a computer system, the method comprising:

- (a) providing one or more chosen functions in a database system, the one or more functions provided by a messaging system that is external to the database system, further comprising
 - (a1) adding the one or more functions as user-defined functions in the database system wherein the user-defined functions comprise one or

more of functions to: place a message on a queue of the messaging system, retrieve at least one message from the queue, non-destructively retrieve all messages from the queue, and read at least one message from the queue, the user-defined functions specifying a service endpoint, a destination, and a delivery policy, and

(a2) providing the one or more functions from a publish and subscribe-based messaging system; and

(b) utilizing one or more chosen functions from the database system within structured query language statements to access the messaging system from the database system, wherein the messaging system is a separate application from the database system such that the messaging capabilities are provided externally to the database by the messaging system.

Chandra discloses an advanced message queuing system that is integrated into a database system (Abstract, Lines 1-2). In addition, "Each queue is part of a table in a relational database, and a queue table holds a set of queues" (Abstract, Lines 6-7). Examiner has asserted, "Though it is stored on the database server of a relational database system, the messaging system is a separate application from the applications that manage the database (*Emphasis added* - 04.03.09 Office Action, Page 3). In essence, Examiner has attempted to equate the queue tables 214 (Chandra, Figure 2) with the message system queue 11 of the present invention (Figure 1). Applicant respectfully disagrees that there is any equivalence or basis for suggesting such.

First, the collection of queue messages 208 belong to queue tables 214 which help comprise the relational database application system 300. Thus, Figures 2-3 of Chandra

represent that the messaging system is an integral part of the relational database application system 300, rather than a separate component of the database system, as is the case in the recited invention. Second, Chandra explicitly discloses, "...an advanced message queuing mechanism is provided in a database system," and "The message queuing system forms a part of the foundation or kernel of the database system such that queuing operations are accessible to any application adapted to the database" (Column 2, Lines 62-66). Third, Claim 1 of Chandra recites, "...establishing a queue in the memory using a table of the database system" (Column 36, Lines 39-40). Finally, Chandra explicitly teaches against the use of messages queues that are external to the database application, "Such systems often store message queues external to an application and external to a relational database system required by users of the queuing system; accordingly, distributed transactions are required for communication with queues, creating unnecessary system overhead." (Column 2, Lines 15-19). Thus, because Chandra's relational database application system 300 integrates the message queuing system within the database, the queue table 214 effectively operates as just another queue table.

Accordingly, Applicant believes Chandra does not disclose each and every element of the present invention. Applicant further states that Applicant does not agree with the basis for any of the remaining rejections for other claims as set forth in the Office Action. Applicant believes the Chandra reference and its association with the claim set of the present application has been mischaracterized. Applicant notes that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 484 U.S.

827 (1987). The analysis of whether a claim is patentable over the prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102 begins with a determination of the scope of the claim. The properly interpreted claim must then be compared with the prior art. It is understood that the determination of scope of the claims in patent applications is based “not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction ‘in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.’” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316, 75 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(en banc) (quoting *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1830 (Fed. Cir. 2004)).

As Chandra does not disclose or anticipate the present invention nor teach each and every element as disclosed in the present invention, Chandra’s citations do not anticipate or disclose the present invention as in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claim 1 as it is newly amended and presented. Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP PC

July 30, 2009

Date

/Renee R Reid/

Renee R. Reid
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 52,159

Customer Number 45728

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549